

1 DYLAN P. TODD, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 10456
2 TODD W. BAXTER, ESQ.
Admitted Pro Hac Vice
3 McCORMICK, BARSTOW, SHEPPARD,
WAYTE & CARRUTH LLP
4 8337 West Sunset Road, Suite 350
Las Vegas, NV 89113
5 Telephone: (702) 949-1100
Facsimile: (702) 949-1101
6 *dylan.todd@mccormickbarstow.com*

7 ERON Z. CANNON
Nevada Bar No. 8013
8 FAIN ANDERSON VANDERHOEF
ROSENDAHL O'HALLORAN SPILLANE PLLC
9 701 5th Avenue #4750
Seattle, Washington 98104
10 Telephone: (206) 749-0094
Facsimile: (206) 749-0194
11 *eron@favros.com*

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY,
ALLSTATE PROPERTY & CASUALTY
16 INSURANCE COMPANY, ALLSTATE
INDEMNITY COMPANY, and ALLSTATE
17 FIRE & CASUALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 MARJORIE BELSKY, MD; MARIO
21 TARQUINO, MD; MARJORIE BELSKY,
MD, INC., doing business as INTEGRATED
22 PAIN SPECIALISTS; and MARIO
TARQUINO, MD, INC., DOES 1-100, and
23 ROES 101-200,

24 Defendants.

25 AND RELATED CLAIMS
26
27
28

CASE NO. 2:15-cv-2265-MMD-CWH

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION
OF DOCUMENTS FROM RALPH A.
SCHWARTZ, P.C. [ECF No.
330]**

1 Presently before the Court is a motion to compel production of documents to non-party law
2 firm Ralf A. Schwartz, PC (“Schwartz”) filed on August 7, 2018. (ECF No. 330). Schwartz filed a
3 Response on August 21, 2018 (ECF No. 338), and Plaintiffs’ Reply was filed on August 28, 2018
4 (ECF No. 344).

5 Plaintiffs served Schwartz with a subpoena pursuant to F.R.C.P. 45 for the production of
6 documents regarding communications and payments made by and between Schwartz and the
7 Defendants during Schwartz’ representation of nine (9) parties in personal injury claims for which
8 Plaintiffs paid a settlement on behalf of Plaintiffs’ insured. Schwartz objected to the subpoena and
9 moved to quash on grounds: 1) the information was protected by attorney-client privilege; 2)
10 Schwartz’s client directed the information not be produced due to HIPAA concerns; 3) request
11 information constituted a trade secret or confidential commercial communication; and 4) the requested
12 information was unduly burdensome as being cumulative because the information could have been
13 requested of the Defendants. Plaintiffs respond that the requested information is proper under
14 F.R.C.P. 26, and that Schwartz’s on attorney-client privilege and unduly burdensome and
15 cumulativeness do not apply. Plaintiffs contend that Schwartz has failed to demonstrate the required
16 showing for protection under trade secret or confidential commercial communications, and that all
17 objections based on confidentiality can be addressed by including Schwartz as a party to the existing
18 protective order. The Court will address each of these arguments.

19 F.R.C.P. 26 (b)(10) provides that parties “may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged
20 matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case.” The
21 information requested by Plaintiffs is both relevant and proportional to the needs of this case, as it
22 involves claims of RICO violations, misrepresentation and fraud where the amount of claimed
23 damages by all parties is very high. A Court must quash or modify a subpoena that requires disclosure
24 of protected matter, Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(3)(A)(iv); and may quash or modify a subpoena that requires
25 disclosure of commercial information, Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(3)(B)(i). However, courts should also
26 consider other factors in deciding motions to quash or modify a subpoena, including the breadth or
27 specificity of the discovery request, and the relevance of the requested information. *See Moon v. SCP*
28 *Pool Corp.*, 232 F.R.D. 633, 637 (C.D. Cal. 2005).

1 **A. Attorney-Client Privilege**

2 The attorney-client privilege protects confidential disclosures made by a client to an attorney
3 in order to obtain legal advice, as well as an attorney’s advice in response to such disclosures.” *In re*
4 *Grand Jury Investigation*, 974 F.2d 1068, 1070 (9th Cir.1992) (emphasis added). Although Schwartz
5 alleges an attorney-client privilege, the subpoena does not request communications between Schwartz
6 and its clients. The subpoena requests documents and communications between Schwartz and the
7 Defendant doctors only. Schwartz does not identify any communications that actually classify for the
8 privilege, and has not provided a privilege log, or distinguished in any way those documents claimed
9 to be protected from those that are not attorney-client communications. The attorney-client privilege
10 argument is without merit, and therefore overruled.

11 **B. Trade Secret and Confidential Commercial Communications**

12 Schwartz contends that disclosing the requested information and documents would violate its
13 trade secret and confidential commercial communications protections, because it would disclose how
14 Schwartz communicates with medical providers and negotiates billing reductions in personal injury
15 litigations. “Confidential commercial information is information which, if disclosed, would cause
16 substantial economic harm to the competitive position of the entity from whom the information was
17 obtained.” *Diamond State Ins. Co. v. Rebel Oil Co., Inc.*, 157 F.R.D. 691, 697 (D. Nev. 1994). The
18 person asserting confidentiality has the burden of showing that the privilege applies to a given set of
19 documents. F.R.C.P. 45(d); *see also In re Grand Jury Investigation*, 974 F.2d 1068, 1070 (9th
20 Cir.1992). Furthermore, a party must “demonstrate by competent evidence” that the information it is
21 seeking to protect is a trade secret, which would be harmful if disclosed. *Upjohn Co. v. Hygieia*
22 *Biological Labs.*, 151 F.R.D. 355, 358 (E.D. Cal. 1993).

23 Schwartz has failed to meet its burden to provide a particularized showing of exactly how the
24 requested information falls within the confidential commercial communication or trade secret
25 protection. Furthermore, the information requested is not being disclosed to a competitor, and there
26 has been no evidence or argument to support a claim that economic harm would result from the
27 production of the requested information. Therefore, Schwartz’s objection on the grounds of
28 confidential commercial information and trade secret is overruled.

1 **C. Unduly Burdensome and Cumulative**

2 Schwartz contends that since the requested information involves medical information that was
3 available to Plaintiffs in the underlying personal injury cases, it would be unduly burdensome for
4 Schwartz to comply with the subpoena sine Plaintiffs would obtain that information from their prior
5 retained defense counsel. Schwartz also argues that since the information requested is
6 communications between Schwartz and the Defendants, Plaintiffs should be required to seek that
7 information from Defendants directly. Finally, Schwartz argues that it is unduly burdensome to locate
8 correspondence for nine (9) prior claimants.

9 Schwartz's argument that Plaintiffs had ample opportunity to obtain the information in prior
10 lawsuits is unpersuasive. F.R.C.P. 26 (b)(2)(C)(ii) states the Court must limit the extent of discovery
11 where "the party seeking discovery has had ample opportunity to obtain the information by discovery
12 in the action." The prior litigations to which Schwartz is referring are personal injury actions where
13 Plaintiffs were not a party. Those litigations took place years before this action, and did not involve
14 the claims and causes of action contained in the instant lawsuit. Moreover, some of the requested
15 information comes from claims where no litigation ensued.

16 This also applies to Schwartz's position that Plaintiffs could have obtained the information
17 directly from Defendants. A party is permitted to obtain documents from a non-party under F.R.C.P.
18 45, even if the subpoena requests documents that are similar or identical to those previously sought
19 from a party in the action. *See, Diamond State Ins. Co. v. Rebel Oil Co., Inc.*, 157 F.R.D. 691, 697 (D.
20 Nev. 1994). While there is the possibility that some of the documents produced might be duplicative,
21 the subpoena is directed towards a non-party that is a separate business entity from the Defendants. It
22 is entirely possible that the files kept by these separate entities may not be identical.

23 The Court is unpersuaded by Schwartz's argument that producing the information would be
24 unduly burdensome because Schwartz is a solo practitioner and would need to spend time reviewing
25 several files to locate the requested information. The subpoena seeks communications only on nine
26 (9) former client files. The Court does not find that this amounts to a significant burden or expense
27 that would require quashing or modifying the subpoena. Therefore, the objection that the documents
28 requested would be cumulative or unduly burdensome is overruled.

1 **D. HIPAA Objections and Confidentiality of Medical Information**

2 Schwartz maintains that its clients have not agreed to allow the law firm to produce the
3 information, and doing so without their consent will result in a violation of its client's confidentiality
4 protections under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPAA"). Schwartz does
5 not dispute that this Court has the power to order production of documents, even in the absence of
6 client-consent.

7 On June 6, 2016, the Court approved a stipulated confidentiality and protective order between
8 the parties. That protective order specifically addresses HIPAA concerns, and contemplates the
9 disclosure of protected health information in this litigation. (ECF No. 49, at 3:1-8). The order
10 addressed the sensitive nature of medical records and communications under HIPAA, as well as the
11 dissemination of other potentially protected or private information relating to a claimant, such as those
12 indicated in Plaintiff's subpoena, and other identified claimants similarly situated. The stipulated
13 confidentiality and protective order was entered into by Plaintiffs and Defendants only, and was
14 approved by this Court on May 20, 2016. (ECF No. 49). Schwartz was not an original party to this
15 protective order, and the Court finds that extending the protections and scope of the order to Schwartz
16 would address any concerns regarding the disclosure of confidential or protected information.

17 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion to compel (ECF No. 330) is
18 GRANTED.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the confidentiality and protective order approved by the
20 Court and filed on June 6, 2016 (ECF No. 49) and all the safeguards and protections contained therein
21 shall apply to Schwartz and to any documents subject to HIPAA or other confidentiality or privacy
22 concerns produced in response to the subpoena issued by Plaintiffs. Schwartz is hereby ordered to
23 comply with Plaintiffs' subpoena issued pursuant to F.R.C.P. 45 and shall produce the requested
24 information and documentation. Schwartz shall have fifteen (15) days from the date of this order to
25 comply with the subpoena.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 IT IS SO ORDERED.

2 DATED this 19 day of December, 2018.

3
4 
5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6 Respectfully submitted:

7 McCORMICK, BARSTOW, SHEPPARD,
8 WAYTE & CARRUTH LLP

9 By /s/ Dylan P. Todd

10 DYLAN P. TODD, ESQ.
11 Nevada Bar No. 10456
12 TODD W. BAXTER, ESQ.
13 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
14 8337 West Sunset Road, Suite 350
15 Las Vegas, NV 89113
16 Telephone: (702) 949-1100
17 Facsimile: (702) 949-1101
18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on this 26th day of September, 2018, a true and correct copy
3 of **PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION**
4 **OF DOCUMENTS FROM RALPH A. SCHWARTZ, P.C. [ECF No. 330]** was served via the
5 United States District Court CM/ECF system on all parties or persons requiring notice.

6 Dennis L. Kennedy, Esq.
7 Joseph A. Liebman, Esq.
8 Joshua P. Gilmore, Esq.
9 BAILEY KENNEDY
8984 Spanish Ridge Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89148
and

10 Peter S Christiansen, Esq.
11 R. Todd Terry, Esq.
12 Kendelee L. Works, Esq.
13 Whitney J. Barrett, Esq.
14 Keely A. Perdue, Esq.
CHRISTIENSEN LAW OFFICES
810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 240-7979
(866) 412-6992 fax

15 Pete@christiansenlaw.com
16 tterry@christiansenlaw.com
17 kworks@christiansenlaw.com
wbarrett@christiansenlaw.com
keely@christiansenlaw.com

18 *Attorneys for Defendants*

Nathan S. Deaver, Esq.
Brice J. Crafton, Esq.
DEAVER & CRAFTON
810 E. Charleston Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89104
(702) 385-5969
(702) 385-6939 fax
shannon@deavercrafton.com
Attorneys for Non-Party Ralph A. Schwartz, P.C.

19 By /s/ Tricia A. Dörner

20 An Employee of McCORMICK, BARSTOW,
21 SHEPPARD, WAYTE & CARRUTH LLP

22 03246-01560 5361154.1
23
24
25
26
27
28